## REMARKS

The above-referenced patent application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action, mailed **August 28, 2006** ("the Action") in which claims 1, 5-11 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moller (US Patent Pub. 2002/0083241 – "Moller") in view of common knowledge in the data processing art. Claims 2-4 and 12-14 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moller in view of common knowledge in the data processing art, and further in view of Barr et al. (US Patent Pub. 2005/0044442 – "Barr").

## Current Status of Claims:

With this amendment, claims 1-5, 7, 8-15, 17, 18 and 21-24 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 11, 17, and 18 are amended and claims 21-24 are added as presented above. Claims 6, 9, 16, 19 and 20 are canceled. Support for the amendments can be found in the application. No new matter has been introduced.

## 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of claims 1, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17 and 18:

Claim 1, as currently amended, is as follows:

> "An apparatus comprising:
>     a first unit coupled to a variable speed bus, the first unit *allocated a first portion of bandwidth on the variable speed bus*;
>     a second unit coupled to the variable speed bus, the second unit *allocated a second portion of bandwidth on the variable speed bus;* and
>     a clock throttling logic to adjust a clock frequency associated with the variable speed bus *responsive to a change in at least one of the first unit's utilization of the first portion of bandwidth on the variable speed bus and the second unit's utilization of the second portion of bandwidth on the variable speed bus.*"

Application No. 10/810,026
Atty. Docket No. P18957

-6-

Examiner Ray
Art Unit 2111

Emphasis added.

Moller does not teach or suggest at least the above emphasized portions of currently amended claim 1. Moller describes arbitrators or clock units that adapt a bus clock signal _based only on the number of transmitter units_ that send data on a data bus (e.g., determined by counting requests or collisions). See paragraphs [0031], [0032] and [0043]. Moller includes no description of allocating bandwidth to these transmitter units and then adapting the clock signal responsive to a _change in the utilization of that allocated bandwidth._ As a result, Moller does not teach or suggest at least the emphasized portions of claim 1 and common knowledge in the data processing art does not cure the above stated deficiencies in Moller. Thus, the Action fails to support a _prima facie_ 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 1 and Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claim 10 includes similar elements to those emphasized for claim 1 above. In particular, to "adjust a clock frequency associated with the variable speed _bus based on a change in the device's utilization of the allocated portion of bandwidth on the variable speed bus._" See Claim 10. Emphasis added. Also, claims 5, 7, 8, 11, 15, 17 and 18 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 10. Thus, Applicant also requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of claims 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17 and 18 be withdrawn.

Application No. 10/810,026
Atty. Docket No. P18957                -7-                Examiner Ray
                                                        Art Unit 2111

PAGE 12/13 * RCVD AT 12/11/2006 4:09:46 PM [Eastern Standard Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/41 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:5032641729 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-08

## 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection of claims 2-4 and 12-14:

On page 4 of the Action claims 2-4 and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moller in view of common knowledge in the data processing art as applied in claim 1 and 10 and further in view of Barr. As mentioned above, Moller fails to describe each an every element of claims 1 and 10 and common knowledge in the data processing art does not cure the deficiencies in Moller. Also Barr was not cited to cure the deficiencies described above for Moller and Applicant submits that Barr does not cure those deficiencies. Since claims 2-4 and 12-14 depend from one of independent claims 1 and 10, Applicant requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

## Conclusion

*The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.*

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,
Peter R. Munguia

Date: <u>December 11, 2006</u>

<u>/Ted A. Crawford/Reg. No. 50,610/</u>
Ted A. Crawford
Reg. No. 50,610
Patent Attorney for Assignee Intel Corporation

Intel Corporation
PO Box 5326
SC4-202
Santa Clara, CA 95056-5326
Tel. (503) 712.2799

Application No. 10/810,026
Atty. Docket No. P18957

-8-

Examiner Ray
Art Unit 2111